

Remarks***The Examiner Interview***

This Supplemental Amendment and Reply is in response to an Examiner's interview conducted on January 8, 2009. During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejections. Applicants thank the Examiner for her time and her thoughtful reconsideration of the claims and the rejections during the interview. **Applicants request that the Examiner consider this Supplemental Reply, along with the Reply filed with the RCE on December 11, 2008.** It is Applicant's understanding that these amendments, and the arguments presented in these documents, are sufficient to place the application in condition for allowance.

Status Of The Claims and Support For The Amendments and New Claims

Entry of the proposed amendments and reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. The proposed amendments are made solely to advance the prosecution of the claims.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 4, 6-7 and 9-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 are the independent claims. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 8 were previously cancelled. New claims 9, 10 and 11 have been added. Claim 7 was previously withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to more accurately reflect the scope of the invention in accordance with the interview with the Examiner on January 8, 2009. Support for these amendments can found throughout the application, e.g., [0011], [0026], and Examples 1 and 5. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10 and 11 have been added, to incorporate additional features as discussed with the Examiner on January 8, 2009. Support for these claims can be found throughout the application, e.g., in originally filed claim 1, [0011], and [0021]. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections of claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Galasso et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,425,407) in view of Booth et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,330,789) and Holko (U.S. Pat. No. 5,021,107). Claim 1 has been amended to more accurately reflect the scope of the invention. Specifically, claim 1 now recites forming by thermal diffusion *during the heat treatment one SiC layer, and one Si layer over the SiC layer*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Galasso does not teach forming by thermal diffusion during the heat treatment one SiC layer, and one Si layer over the SiC layer. Rather, Galasso teaches a two step process to make two layers, both steps making the same layer, the first step utilizing chemical vapor deposition, and a second step utilizing pack cementation. Thus, Galasso does not form two layers by any a single heat treatment process.

Likewise, Booth and Holko do not teach forming by thermal diffusion during the heat treatment one SiC layer, and one Si layer over the SiC layer. Holko is only cited by

the Examiner for the proposition of using a volatile carrier to apply powders. Booth teaches a two step conversion coating method to make two layers, the first step forming a SiC/Si layer, and the second step forming a SiC/Boron/Si layer. Thus, Booth also does not form two layers by any a single heat treatment process.

Thus, even a combination of Galasso, Booth, and Holko does NOT teach a heat treating process which forms two layers. Therefore, the documents cited by the Examiner **achieve their compositions using different methods, and do not include each step of the method as recited in claim 1.**

Because each and every element of amended claim 1 is not found in the cited documents, and claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1, claims 1, 4 and 6 cannot be found obvious in view of the cited documents. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Scott M. Woodhouse
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 54,747

Date: JANUARY 12, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

925623_1.DOC